

REMARKS

In the September 5, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1, 6-18 and 21 were pending and all of the claims under consideration were rejected. Claim 21 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, claims 1, 6-18 are pending and under consideration. Claims 1, 6-10 and 18 have been amended. Applicants assert that no new matter has been added. Support for the amendment can be found in the Specification, for example, on page 19, lines 1-19 and Figures 3, 4, 9 and 10.

Objection to Claims

On page 3 in item 9, the Office Action objected to claims 1 and 21 as allegedly being duplicates. Claim 21 has been canceled, and therefore, the rejection is moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

On page 4 in items 11 and 12, the Office Action rejected claims 1 and 21 under the first and second paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 112 due to the recitation of "analyzing a source address in data received from a sender through the network in the form of uni-cast communication." Claim 21 has been cancelled, and therefore, the rejection is moot with respect to claim 21.

Applicants submit that the amendments to claim 1 herein, clearly recite an invention that is fully supported by the specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under the first and second paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**Claims 1, 6, 11, 15-17 and 21**

On pages 7-11 in items 16-23, the Office Action rejected claims 1, 6, 11, 15-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0194367), in view of what is well known in the art and further in view of Wingard et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,948,089) and Zheng et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0181400). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

extracting, from a source address of the data, an identifier and control information including a command and/or information specifying a relay and copy/transfer of the data received from the sender, by analyzing a source address field of the data (lines 7-11). For example, as shown in Figure 3 of the present application, a data packet can include a destination address, a source address, and distribution data. The source address,

however, can also include control information (e.g. a command), as shown in Figure 4 of the present application. Accordingly, the device recited in claim 1 provides the benefit of increased efficiency compared to the more complicated control-exclusive protocol, because control information is contained in the source address field, and therefore, a simple high-speed method for transmitting data in the data packet is realized (see specification page 12, lines 7-20).

On page 7 in item 17, the Office Action cited paragraph [0076] of Nakamura et al. as disclosing the feature of "extracting, from the source address control information about a relay and copy/transfer of the received data". Nakamura et al., however, describes a system where a plurality of relay stations are connected by logical tunnels within an IP network. In Nakamura et al., each relay station determines the type of destination address at the Layer 2 level. If the destination type is broadcast, the relay station identifies a tunnel as a relay destination that corresponds to the destination address at the Layer 3 level. Accordingly, Nakamura et al. merely describes a system for distributing a broadcast via logical tunnels by analyzing conventional IP layers. Nakamura et al. is silent on including control information (e.g. a command) in the *source address field* (compare/contrast Nakamura Figs. 3-7 with Figs. 3 and 4 of the present application).

Accordingly, as described above, Nakamura et al. fails to disclose "extracting, from a source... control information including a command... by analyzing a source address field of the received data" as recited by claim 1.

On page 6 in the rejection of claim 18 (which is addressed below), Official Notice was "taken that it is well known in the art that the process of converting from unicast to multicast of Nakamura inherently includes copying or duplicating data before relaying the data to the receivers" (Office Action, page 6, lines 11-13). The Examiner is respectfully requested to provide an example of this type of conversion disclosed in the prior art that would be obvious to use in Nakamura et al. and would be relevant to the broadcast type communication recited in claim 1. Applicants are unaware of any reference disclosing such conversion that would overcome the deficiencies of Nakamura et al. described above.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that neither Wingard et al. nor Zheng et al., individually or combined with each other or with any reference disclosing conversion from unicast to multicast known to the Applicants, cure the deficiencies of Nakamura et al. described above. Accordingly, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed above.

Dependent claims 6, 11 and 15-17 inherit the patentable recitations of their base claim, and therefore, patentably distinguish over the cited art for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1.

Claim 18

On pages 5-7 in items 14 and 15, the Office Action rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al., in view of what is well known in the art and further in view of Wingard et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Nakamura et al. fails to describe "broadcast type communication data including an identifier and control information including a command and/or information specifying a relay and copy/transfer" as recited on lines 4-6 of claim 18.

Applicants submit that Wingard et al., individually or combined with any reference disclosing conversion from unicast to multicast known to the Applicants, fails to describe the deficiencies of Nakamura et al. described above and, therefore, claim 18 patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

Claims 7 & 8

On pages 11-12 in items 24-26, the Office Action rejected claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al. in view of what is well known in the art, Zheng and Wingard, in view of Williams (U.S. 7,080,135). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that Williams fails to cure the deficiencies of the combination of art used to reject claim 1 described above. Accordingly, claims 7 and 8, which depend from claim 1, patentably distinguish over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 9 & 10

On pages 12-13 in items 27-29, the Office Action rejected claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al. in view of what is well known in the art, Zheng and Wingard, in view of Tzeng et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0212814). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that Tzeng et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of the combination of art used to reject claim 1 described above. Accordingly, claims 7 and 8, which depend from claim

1, patentably distinguish over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 12-14

On pages 13-14 in item 30-32, the Office Action rejected claims 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al. in view of what is well known in the art, Zheng and Wingard. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that the Examiner's assertion of Official Notice fails to cure the deficiencies of Nakamura et al., described above. Accordingly, claims 12-14, which depend from claim 1, patentably distinguish over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully request the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 5, 2008

By: /Richard A. Gollhofer/
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-150